NEWCAST: Anticipating Resource Management and QoE Provisioning for Mobile Video Streaming

Imen Triki, Rachid El-Azouzi and Majed Haddad
LIA/CERI, University of Avignon,
Agroparc, BP 1228, 84911, Avignon, France

arXiv:1512.05705v3 [cs.MM] 21 Jan 2016

***Abstract*—The knowledge of future throughput variation in wireless networks using smartphone becomes more and more possible by exploiting the rich contextual information from smartphone sensors through mobile applications and services. Contextual information may include the traffic, mobility and radio conditions. Inspired by the attractive features and potential advantages of this agile resource management, several approaches have been proposed during the last period. However, agile resource management also comes with its own challenges, and there are significant technical issues that still need to be addressed for successful rollout and operation of this technique. In this paper, we propose an approach for anticipating throughput variation for mobile video streaming services. The solution of the optimization problem realizes a fundamental trade-offs among critical metrics that impact the user's perceptual quality of the experience (QoE) and system utilization. Both simulated and real-world traces collected from [1] are carried out to evaluate the performance of the proposed approach. It is shown that our approach provides the accuracy, efficiency and robustness that the new 5G architectures require.**

I. Introduction

The large penetration of devices such as smartphone with wireless connectivity provides new capabilities to support various applications and services. Since the smartphones introduction, mobile networks are witnessing an exponential traffic growth. Due to their smaller form factor, these truly mobile devices allow the users to access the wireless networks while undergoing different types of mobility, posing new challenges to wireless protocols. This creates regimes where wireless networks are pushed to operate close to their performance limits. The evolution of multimedia services in the Internet and the increasing consumer demand for high definition content have led operators and industry to rethink the way networks are dimensioned and quality of experience are optimized from network side and user terminal side. Many studies in the literature have identified the critical metrics that impact the QoE by taking into account both quality and experience [2]. Recent works [3], [4] have developed approaches for understanding how some quality metrics influence user engagement. Authors in [3] quantified the user engagement and identified critical metrics that affect the QoE, e.g., buffering ratio, rate of buffering, start-up delay, rendering quality and average bit rate. [4] showed that stalls or re-buffering events have a significant impact on QoE in the sense that the time spent on re-buffering during a video session can significantly reduce the user engagement. [5] provided guidance to operators for improving user engagement in real time using only network-side measurements. Another aspect is related to variations in the temporal quality of the video. Indeed, authors in [6] suggested that temporal variability in quality can be considered as worse as a constant quality with a lower average bitrate.

Recently, Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP (DASH) or equivalent (Apple HLS, Adobe HDS, etc.) have been proposed as an emerging standard on video delivery in order to minimize video interruption and re-buffering time. In DASH, each video file is divided into multiple small segments according to the size of GOPs (Group of Pictures) and each segment is encoded into multiple quality levels [7]. The segment size is usually between two and ten seconds of video. Various adaptation methods have been proposed to support adaptive HTTP streaming [8]. Their common goal is to make the client chose the most suitable level of the future segment in order to deliver the highest possible QoE. In the literature, adaptive algorithms have been classified in three main classes: buffer-based [9], throughput-based [10] and buffer-throughput-based algorithms [11]. While the first class makes the decision based on the playback buffer occupancy state, the second class makes use of the historical TCP throughput of last few fragments to estimate the current bandwidth and instantaneously adapt the segment quality. Several techniques have been used to estimate the resources from past observations [12]. In an environment with constant throughput, past observations are relevant to predict the future throughput. However, in a highly variable environment, this approach cannot provide accurate estimation of future throughput. Unfortunately, current environments are characterised by their significant variability, essentially due to mobility and heterogeneity of wireless networks.

Recent studies open a promising possibility to accurately predict available resources over a medium horizon. For instance, context acquisition can target the monitoring of contextual situations as soon as they are created. The output can describe the contexts encountered as well as the likelihood of encountering similar contexts in the future [13]. This rises the opportunity to efficiently design the client-side bitrate adaptation by exploiting the knowledge of future throughput variations [14]. In this paper, we design a QoE-driven optimization scheme that realizes the trade-off between system utilization and content resolution under constraints on re-buffering events.

A. Related works

Many strategies have been proposed to adapt the video quality in order to reduce the interruption of playback buffer [9], [15]. Authors in [9] developed a rate adaptation method to enhance DASH performance over multiple content distribution servers. In [16], a method based on customers subjective perception was designed to analyze the impact of bitrate distribution on user's psychology and QoE. Further works in [17] investigated the impact of temporally changing quality by introducing new quality profiles such as quality hoping and switching rate. [11] proposed a predictive control algorithm that can optimally combine throughput and buffer occupancy information. [18] developed a suite of techniques that can guide the trade-offs between stability, fairness, and efficiency leading to a general framework for robust video adaptation. Empirical results in [19] showed that humans appear to be more forgiving on buffer stalls than they are on video quality variations. Long buffer freezing events are even not rated worse than short buffer freezing towards high video quality levels. However in [20], authors incorporated resource managements in DASH QoE provisioning while considering user preferences on rebuffering and cost of video delivery.

Although there is a rich literature on methods for optimizing QoE parameters for video streaming services, anticipating (future) capacity variations have been presented in only few papers. The main idea of this paper is inspired from the paper [21] which designed a QoE-driven optimization problem that exploits knowledge of future capacity. The authors developed a cross-layer transport protocol that minimizes system utilization while avoiding re-buffering events. Their approach allows to reduce the system utilization up to 70%, but their model is only suited for classical video streaming as it ignores important visual quality metrics related to adaptive HTTP streaming such as video resolution and bitrate distribution. In this paper, we assume that the video player can adapt its video quality across segments. The choice of the video quality level can be based on several factors such as the system utilization, the risk of playback buffer interruption and quality switching.

B. Contributions and Organisation

This study provides important insight in the design and optimization of adaptive video streaming by exploiting the knowledge of future capacity variations. The objective is to design the client-side bitrate adaptation that performs under diverse opening regimes (e.g., high throughput variability). This framework allows us to extend the model developed in [21] by balancing different objectives such as system utilization, video quality and re-buffering events. In short, we can summarize the main contributions of this paper as follows:

- We provide a general optimization framework for stored video delivery that factors heterogeneity in client preferences, QoE models, capacity and video quality.
- Under the constraint of no re-buffering events, we formally obtained the optimal solution where the transmission schedule is of a threshold type and the coding strategy is of an ascending type.
- We develop an efficient heuristic mechanism that approaches the optimal solution and we evaluate its performance and robustness toward realistic traces .
- Under the hypothesis of tolerating one buffer stall during the streaming session, we evaluate the system performance by forcing stalls at different moments of the video for variant operator's and user's preferences.

II. Problem formulation

We consider a video streaming server where each video file is divided into N small segments and each segment is encoded with L different quality levels. Let l_j be the video quality level j, and b_j its associated bitrate level, where $b_i < b_j$ for $i < j$. For each segment, there is the same number of frames denoted by S. Assume that, while streaming a video, the client requests segments from the server such that only one quality level can be selected at time. Let $b(t)$ be the bitrate level used at time t. In order to characterize this bitrate level with respect to the best quality level, we define $\gamma(t)$ as $\gamma(t) = \frac{b_L}{b(t)}$. At the client side, we assume that the playback buffer is large enough to allow storing the whole video without buffer overflows. We further assume that the playback frame rate holds the same for all video levels, denote it by λ (in fps). To avoid re-buffering events, a prefetching stage is introduced at the beginning of the streaming session. Before starting the video, the media player stores frames until a certain number, called start-up threshold and denoted by Q_0, is reached.

In our problem modeling, we attempt to optimize the system cost and the video quality while taking into account user's perception metrics like re-buffering. This optimization problem will exploit the knowledge of future capacity variations over a finite window of the horizon (see Fig. 13). Let $c(t)$ and $r(t)$ be the average network capacity and the actual used bit rate at time t such that $0 \leq r(t) \leq c(t)$. Next, we define the cost function of our model, which is the sum of two terms: the average system utilization and the weighted average quality of video. As in [21], we define the network utilization cost as

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{r(t)}{c(t)} dt \tag{1}$$

where $\frac{r(t)}{c(t)}$ designs the proportion of resources used at time t, and T defines the video lecture length in (s).

During the session, the number of frames streamed with video quality level j is given by

$$\int_0^T \frac{\delta_{\{b(t)=b_j\}} r(t)\lambda}{b(t)} dt = \int_0^T \frac{\gamma_j(t) r(t)\lambda}{b_L} dt \tag{2}$$

where

$$\gamma_j(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t) & \text{if } b(t) = b_j \quad j \in [1 \dots L] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Denote by w_j the weight associated to video quality level j, where $w_i < w_j$ for $i < j$. The value of w_j represents the user's perception on the video quality level j regarding to the user profile. Hence the normalized weighted average quality of the video is given by

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=L} w_j \int_0^T \gamma_j(t) r(t) \lambda dt}{S_L} \tag{4}$$

where S_L is the video total size in bits when it is coded with the highest bitrate level b_L, i.e., $S_L = \frac{b_L \times S \times N}{\lambda}$. Note that the value of $\gamma_j(t)$ characterizes the profitability of the available resources at time t when the video is streamed with level j instead of level L. Normally, we stream more frames as the bitrate level decreases, which adds more profitability to $r(t)$.

To more explain the meaning of this term, consider a video file of 4 frames and 2 bitrate levels: $b_1 = 6000kbps$ and $b_2 = 3000kbps$. Let $\lambda = 30fps$ and $c(t) = 200kbps$ for 4 lapses of time. Obviously, when 4 frames are coded with b_1 we use all the available resources since b_1 gives $200kbpf$. However when the 2 first frames are coded with b_2 and the 2 other frames are coded with b_1, we use only the three first capacities, since b_2 gives $100kbpf$. In the first case, $\rho = w_1 \times (1 \times 200 + 1 \times 200 + 1 \times 200 + 1 \times 200)/800$ which gives $w_1 \times 1$, but in the second case $\rho = (w_2 \times (2 \times 200) + w_1 \times (1 \times 200 + 1 \times 200) + 0 \times 200)/800$ which gives $w_2 \times 0.5 + w_1 \times 0.5$; In both cases we fall in with the proportion of each bitrate level multiplied by its corresponding weight, which is clearly what we need to express through the QoE.

It goes without saying that higher QoE comes at higher system utilisation, but it arrives that a user wishes to reduce his system utilisation cost in return of a humble video quality, or that a content provider wishes to reduce delivery cost versus a minimal video quality that guarantees clients engagement. It would be even interesting for operators if they save network resources for further usage.

To tradeoff these preferences, we define a positive constant parameter a that emphasizes or not the QoE part. Our optimization cost function can then be defined as

$$\mathcal{F} = \sigma - a\rho.$$

We start with the case where there are no re-buffering events during the session. Thus, when minimizing our cost function $\mathcal{F}$ we are constrained to ensure that the playback buffer does not fall empty. At the end of section V-B we study the case where we tolerate a re-buffering event during the session.

Let $u(t)$ and $l(t)$ be the *cumulative* number of arrival frames and the *cumulative* number of frames watched by the user till time t under the no-re-buffering events assumption. Then, the buffer underflow constraint can be defined as $u(t) \geq l(t)\ \forall t \leq T$. Given the network bitrate $r(t)$ and the corresponding streamed bitrate level $b(t)$, we compute the network frame rate as $\frac{\lambda\ r(t)}{b(t)}$.

Let (r, γ) denote the video transmission strategy, where r defines the transmission schedule and γ characterizes the bitrate level strategy. We summarize the optimization problem without re-buffering, as follows

$$\min_{(r,\gamma)} \mathcal{F}(r,\gamma) = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt - a\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=L} w_j \int_0^T \gamma_j(t) r(t) dt}{S_L}$$
$$s.t \begin{cases} \int_0^t \frac{\lambda\ c(t)\gamma_1}{b_L} \geq l(t) & \forall t \leq T \\ \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^{j=L} \frac{\lambda\ r(t)\gamma_j(t)}{b_L} \geq l(t) & \forall t \leq T \\ \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^{j=L} \frac{\lambda\ r(t)\gamma_j(t)}{b_L} = l(T) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$



Fig. 1. Demonstration of the threshold strategy.

Where the first constraint ensures the existence of at least one solution that defines a mono-coded video using the lowest bitrate level b_1.

III. Properties of optimal solution without re-buffering events

A. The threshold scheme for transmission schedule

Before introducing the properties of optimal solution, let us define the threshold strategy based on data transmission schedule.

Definition 1. *Giving the network capacity c, we define the threshold transmission schedule by*

$$r_{th}(t) = \begin{cases} c(t) & \text{if } c(t) \geq \alpha \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Note that in [21], the video is encoded in one quality level. However, considering multiple quality levels with variable size makes our optimisation problem different to the one in [21], and the threshold demonstration too.

Proposition 1. *Assume that there exists a feasible solution that satisfies the constraints in (5), then there exists an optimal strategy (r_{th}, γ) of optimisation problem (5), where r_{th} is a threshold transmission schedule.*

Proof: Let $c(t)$ and $r(t)$ be the network capacity and the user transmission bitrate (in bps) on a given time interval $[0, \epsilon]$ as depicted in Fig. 1. Without loss of generality[1] and for the sake of illustration, we choose an interval where $c(t)$ is monotonically decreasing as shown in Fig. 1. As we have $r(t) \leq c(t) \forall t \in [0, \epsilon]$, there $\exists\ (\delta, \beta) \in [0, \frac{\epsilon}{2}] \times [0, 1]$ such that $\forall\ t \in [0, \delta]$

$$c(t) \geq c(t + \epsilon - \delta) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\int_0^\delta \frac{r(t) + \beta r(t + \delta - \epsilon)}{c(t)} dt \leq \delta \quad (8)$$

where inequality (7) derives from the decreasing pace of c, and relation (8) derives from the fact that some data at the end can be transmitted beforehand. (According to the figure above, the hatched area on the right can be entirely shifted to

[1]The proof still holds for a monotonically increasing $c(t)$.

the left, which gives a value of β equal to 1). On the other hand, we have

$$\int_0^{\epsilon} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt = \int_0^{\delta} \frac{r(t)+\beta r(t+\epsilon-\delta)}{c(t)}dt + \int_{\delta}^{\epsilon-\delta} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt + \int_{\epsilon-\delta}^{\epsilon} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt - \int_{\epsilon-\delta}^{\epsilon} \frac{\beta r(t)}{c(t-\epsilon+\delta)}dt \quad (9)$$

Using Inequality in (7), we obtain

$$\int_0^{\epsilon} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt \geq \int_0^{\delta} \frac{r(t)+\beta r(t+\epsilon-\delta)}{c(t)}dt + \int_{\delta}^{\epsilon-\delta} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt + \int_{\epsilon-\delta}^{\epsilon} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt) - \int_{\epsilon-\delta}^{\epsilon} \frac{\beta r(t)}{c(t)}dt \quad (10)$$

Obviously, if

$$\int_0^{\delta} \frac{r(t)+\beta r(t+\delta-\epsilon)}{c(t)}dt = \delta,$$

then all the given capacities in $[0, \delta]$ will be used, i.e, all the white surface in Fig 1 will be filled. In that case, we define a new transmission schedule $r'(t)$ such that

$$r'(t) = \begin{cases} c(t) & \text{t} \in [0, \delta] \\ r(t) & \text{t} \in [\delta, \epsilon-\delta] \\ (1-\beta)r(t) & \text{t} \in [\epsilon-\delta, \epsilon] \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

which gives

$$\int_0^{\epsilon} \frac{r(t)}{c(t)}dt \geq \int_0^{\epsilon} \frac{r'(t)}{c(t)}dt$$

Otherwise, if

$$\int_0^{\delta} \frac{r(t)+\beta r(t+\delta-\epsilon)}{c(t)}dt < \delta, \quad (12)$$

then β will be equal to 1 since we aim at swapping as much data as possible from the worst capacities to the best ones. Therefore, to completely use the highest available capacities, we must repeat this same operation on $[0, \epsilon-\delta]$ considering a new transmission function $r'(t)$ verifying

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^{\delta} \frac{r'(t)}{c(t)}dt = \int_0^{\delta} \frac{r(t)+\beta r(t+\delta-\epsilon)}{c(t)}dt \\ r'(t) = r(t) \ \forall \ t \in [\delta, \epsilon-\delta] \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

In both cases, inequality (10) remains correct, which means that transmitting data using the highest capacity values is less expensive in terms of network utilization cost. As we perform this operation on all the future window, we end up having all the highest capacities fully used and all the lowest one unused, which is clearly a threshold transmission schedule as defined in Definition 1.

Let us now focus on the impact of the threshold strategy on the second term of the cost function and the re-buffereing constraints. We need the following conditions to be satisfied

1) the bitrate levels used at the intervals concerned by the swapping-operation must be the same,
2) data swapping should not interrupt a segment transmission schedule, otherwise it is abandoned,
3) swapping data should not violate the stall constraint, otherwise it is abandoned.

It is somehow intuitive that sending data beforehand does not affect, in any way, the quality of video lecture since, as we have assumed, the playback buffer is large enough to store all the video, and hence there is no risk that packets will be rejected as we transmit much data at earlier times. Therefore, any swapping to earlier higher capacity regions will be performed without violating the stall constraints. However, when it is a matter of a non decreasing capacity-function, each swapping to later higher capacity regions has to be checked whether or not it meets the stall constraints. As we only change the bitrate levels' order without varying the amount of data of each bitrate level, we ensure that the same QoE defined in ρ will be maintained. Thereby, the resulting strategy $(r_{th}, \gamma_{r_{th}})$ improves the performance of the problem in (5), which completes the proof. ■

In practice, the decision on α is made progressively in function of time and the future capacities and doesn't follow the previous demonstration, since if not, it becomes complicated to generate such a threshold scheme. In section IV, we design an approach to build a threshold strategy for the transmission schedule.

B. Ascending bitrate level strategy

In this section we study the proprieties of the bitrate level strategy under a threshold based transmission schedule. Precisely, we analyze the impact of video levels' order on the setting of α.

Definition 2. *We say a bitrate level strategy is* **ascending** *if the quality level of segments increases during the session, i.e., for all* $0 \leq t \leq t' \leq T$

$$b(t) \leq b(t') \text{ i.e., } \gamma(t) \geq \gamma(t')$$

Proposition 2. *Assume that there exists a threshold-based solution* (r_{th}, γ) *that satisfies constraints in (5), then there exists a threshold-based ascending bitrate level solution* (r'_{th}, γ') *that optimizes problem in (5).*

Proof: Pick a suite of N quality levels in a non-ascending order (a level per segment) that allows a smooth streaming of the video over the future horizon, then, according to this suite, set a threshold solution (r_{th}, γ) such that the first constraints violation will occur at $t = s_n$ if we set a threshold upper than α.

Suppose that b_1 and b_2 are two bitrate levels used respectively on $[\tau, \tau+\delta]$ and $[\tau', \tau'+\delta']$ as depicted in Fig. 2, such that

$$\tau + \delta < s_n, \quad \tau' > s_n, \quad b_1 > b_2$$

and

$$\int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} r_{th}(t)dt = \int_{\tau'}^{\tau'+\delta'} r_{th}(t)dt$$

Denote by $fr_{th}(t)$ the network frame rate at time t. As $b_1 > b_2$, the number of transmitted frames during $[\tau', \tau'+\delta']$ is greater than the number of frames transmitted on $[\tau, \tau+\delta]$. Therefore, $\exists \ \beta > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\tau'}^{\tau'+\delta'} fr_{th}(t)dt = \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} fr_{th}(t)dt + \beta \quad (14)$$

Suppose that we switch between b_1 and b_2 on the two intervals in question. Then, the number of cumulative received frames at s_n will be increased by β. Let u and u' be



Fig. 2. Demonstration of the ascending coding reates strategy



Fig. 3. Impact of bitrate levels switching on the cumulative number of arrival frames u.

respectively the cumulative number of arrival frames function before and after switching, therefore,

$$u'(s_n) = u(s_n) + \beta \tag{15}$$

If we assume that $u'(s_n)$ is large enough to allow increasing the threshold without violating the constraints at $t = s_n$ and later, then the cost function will be reduced, if not, the threshold remains the same without changing the system performances. In fact, as explained in previous sections, sending data beforehand will simply add more flexibility toward constraints at early times, since the buffer is assumed to be big enough. We show, by the following, that the streaming is still possible with the same threshold once we switch levels' order. Let fr'_{th} be the network frame rate function after switching, therefore we have:

$$fr'_{th}(t) \ > fr_{th}(t) \ \forall t \in [\tau, \tau + \delta[\tag{16}$$

$$fr'_{th}(t) \ < fr_{th}(t) \ \forall t \in [\tau', \tau' + \delta'[\tag{17}$$

$$\int_{\tau}^{\tau+\delta} fr'_{th}(t) - fr_{th}(t)\ dt = \int_{\tau'}^{\tau'+\delta'} fr_{th}(t) - fr'_{th}(t)\ dt = \beta \tag{18}$$

And we define u' as

$$u'(t) = \begin{cases} u(t) & \text{t} < \tau \\ u(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^{t} fr'_{th}(s)\ ds & \text{t} \in [\tau, \tau + \delta[\\ u(t) + \beta & \text{t} \in [\tau + \delta, \tau'[\\ u(\tau') + \beta + \int_{\tau'}^{t} fr'_{th}(s)\ ds & \text{t} \in [\tau', \tau' + \delta'[\\ u(t) & \text{t} \geq \tau + \delta' \end{cases} \tag{19}$$



Fig. 4. Optimal threshold-based solution with ascending bitrate levels.

The main focus here, is to prove that $u'(t) \geq u(t)\ \forall t \in [0, T]$ to show that u' also meets the stall constraints (See Fig. 3). Actually the cumulative watched frames function l will remain the same as the frame rate λ holds the same for all bitrate levels. Obviously, $\forall\ t \notin [\tau', \tau' + \delta'[$, we have $u'(t) \geq u(t)$, however, for $t \in [\tau', \tau' + \delta'[$ we have

$$u'(t) - u(t) = \beta - \int_{\tau'}^{t} fr_{th}(s) - fr'_{th}(s)\ ds. \tag{20}$$

which is clearly positive according to (17) and (18). Finally, streaming the segments in an ascending bitrate levels' order may result in higher thresholds which reduces better the cost function and never regresses the problem performances. Note that a simple switching between levels' order does not impact the QoE term since the proportion of each quality level is kept the same. ■

IV. Algorithmic approaches

A. Approaches under no re-buffering events

1) Algorithm for optimal threshold-based solution with ascending bitrate levels: The principle of this algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 4 and can be summarized in three major points: (i) We first look at all the possible values of $\alpha \in [\alpha_{min}, \alpha_{max}]$ that satisfy the constraints in (5) while associating to each one the highest possible video quality, (ii) Suppose that we obtain a set of M possible thresholds $\{\alpha_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, M;\ \alpha_i < \alpha_j\ ,\ i < j\}$. Therefore, for each threshold and its corresponding video quality, we compute the resulting cost function $\mathcal{F}$, (iii) The optimal solution corresponds to the one that minimizes $\mathcal{F}$. The accuracy of this algorithm increases with M at the expand of increasing complexity. In Section IV-A4, we present an heuristic approach to determine the footstep $\alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_i$ which directly impacts the value of M.

2) Approach for optimal thresholds: To obtain optimal thresholds with the lowest complexity we propose to try all the capacity values in an ascending way, c_{min} will correspond



Fig. 5. Network capacity and threshold α.



Fig. 6. Tree of choice for setting optimal ascending bitrate levels.

to the lowest threshold, the highest threshold, however, will be defined when a constraint violation appears for the first time. Fig.5 illustrates the example used for the simulation section.

3) Approach for optimal ascending bitrate levels: To maximize the QoE with an ascending bitrate level strategy, we construct a tree of N levels, where each level corresponds to a segment of a video (see Fig. 6). A node of a tree level i corresponds to the quality level used for the i^{th} segment such that its parent-node (if it exists) is a level of a worse or equal quality, its child-nodes (if they exist) are levels of a better or equal quality. We construct the tree level by level. At each level, we remove the nodes that cause a constraint violation so that to minimize the number of nodes at the bottom of the tree. At each level, we compute the partial-QoE till reaching the end of the tree. The optimal suite of bitrate levels corresponds to the path that maximizes the QoE. The key shortcoming of this algorithm is its complexity may reach up to $\mathcal{O}((L+1)^N)$. Clearly, this algorithm is very consuming in processing time and thus is very hurdling for online streaming services. In the next section, we propose a heuristic that gives sub-optimal strategy with polynomial complexity.

4) Heuristic for aNticipating qoE With threshold sCheme And aScending biTrate levels (NEWCAST): Let γ_α and $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ be, respectively, the ascending bitrate level strategy and the cost function under r_α-based transmission schedule. The main steps of the proposed heuristic are described in Algorithm 1, where INVEST represents the approach for generating sub-optimal thresholds and AWARE represents the heuristic for setting sub-optimal ascending bitrate levels.

5) Heuristic for generating thresholds: INcrease with VariablE foot STep (INVEST): The increase on α is performed



Fig. 7. INVEST: INcrease with VariablE foot STep.

by adding a variable footstep at each iteration depending on the dynamic of the network capacity. The idea behind this approach is that setting a constant small footstep over the whole algorithm can be judicious at some iterations, but may lead to higher complexity. On the other hand, setting a constant high footstep can be reasonable at some iterations, but may result on lower accuracy. To overcome this hurdle, we fix the amount of data that we wish to abandon at each step (denoted by Q). Then, we adjust the value of α which gives the corresponding variable footstep (see Fig. 7). The main steps of the proposed approach are described in Algorithm 2.

6) Heuristic for Anticipating qoe With Ascending bitRate lEvels (AWARE): In Algorithm 3, we propose a fast heuristic for maximizing the QoE. Our simulations results show that the outcoming solution of AWARE approaches at 98% the optimal solution in terms of QoE. The principle of the proposed heuristic is illustrated in Fig. 8: We start by assigning the lowest level to all video segments. Then, we keep increasing the levels progressively starting by the end of the video as long as the constraints are satisfied. Once a constraint is violated, we choose the previous level of the segment. The number of loops is equal to $L-1$. To reduce at maximum the startup delay, which is a prominent key QoE factor (but not included in our optimization problem), we set by default the buffering-cache segments to the lowest video quality and use a greedy [2] transmission instead of using a threshold-based transmission. As can be seen in Fig. 9, an inherent advantage of this algorithm is that it ensures a progressive increase of the quality levels instead of an aggressive increase as in the optimal solution, which is quite more appreciable for the user's perception.

B. Approaches under re-buffering events

So far, we have assumed that no rebuffing events are acceptable for the video streaming. To go further with the analysis, we adapt our approach to the case where K stalls happen when using the lowest quality and maximum system utilization cost. In such cases, we proceed as follows: We first spot the K segments where the stalls may happen. We then divide the video into $K+1$ parts. At each part, we

[2] A greedy transmission uses all the available network capacities.



Fig. 8. AWARE: Heuristic for Anticipating qoe With Ascending bitRate lEvels.



Fig. 9. Comparative example between optimal approach and AWARE.

independently run the NEWCAST algorithm as if we had different streaming sessions. This approach keeps the same results for first parts of the video (just before the K^{th} stall), while at the same time, tends to enhance performances of the last part of the video as it may result in a lower system utilization or in a higher QoE (depending on the value of a). As it is now possible to enhance results by exploiting the NEWCAST algorithm in the presence of re-buffering events, we propose in Section V-B to study the impact of forcing a re-buffering event with the NEWCAST algorithm.

V. Implementation and Simulations Results

A. Simulations tools and setup

All the simulations have been performed using Matlab server R2015b on a Dell PowerEdge T420 Intel Xeon running Ubuntu 14.04. The network capacity is randomly generated around a given mean throughput and the streaming session is configured according to some DASH and Youtube parameters

Algorithm 1: NEWSCAST: aNticipating qoE With threshold sCheme And aScending biTrate levels

Data: $c, VideoProperties, L, w, Q$
$\alpha \leftarrow c_{min}$; $i \leftarrow 1$;
$[PossibleTransmission, r_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha] =$ ***AWARE***$(c, \alpha, videoProperties, L)$
while $PossibleTransmission$ **do**
  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha = computeObjFunction(c, r_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, w)$
  $i = i + 1$
  $\alpha =$ ***INVEST***(c, i, Q)
  $[PossibleTransmission, r_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha] =$ ***AWARE***$(c, \alpha, videoProperties, L)$
end
$\mathcal{F}^*_{\alpha^*} = min\{\mathcal{F}_\alpha\}$
$\alpha_{th} = \alpha^*$
return $(\alpha_{th}, \gamma_{\alpha_{th}})$

Algorithm 2: INVEST: INcrease with VariablE foot STep

Data: c, i, Q
$SortedC = sort(c)$;
$CumSortedC = CumulativeSum(SortedC)$;
$ind = max(find(CumSortedC \leq i \times Q))$;
return $SortedC(ind)$

Algorithm 3: AWARE: Anticipating qoe With Ascending bitRate lEvels

Data: $c, \alpha_{th}, videoProperties, Levels$
$N \leftarrow NumberOfSegments$;
$L \leftarrow NumberOfLevels$;
$s \leftarrow 1$; $SegmentsList[1:N] \leftarrow l_s$;
while $s < L$ **do**
  $s = s + 1$;
  $Start = FirstSegment(l_{s-1})$;
  $End = N$;
  $middle = (End - Start)div2 + 1$;
  while $middle \geq 1$ *and* $End \geq Start$ *and* $middle \leq End)$ **do**
    $init = SegmentsList$;
    $SegmentsList[middle : End] = l_s$;
    $SegmentsList[1 : SegmentsInCache] = l_1$;
    $Test = ExistViolation(SegmentsList, c, \alpha, videoProperties)$;
    if $Test$ **then**
      $SegmentsList[middle : End] = init[middle : End]$;
      $middle = middle + (End - middle div 2 + 1$;
    else
      $End = middle - 1$;
      $middle = Start + (End - Start)div2 + 1$;
    end
  end
end
$[r_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha] = TransmitVideo(c, \alpha, VideoProperties, SegmentsList)$;
$Test = ExistViolation(SegmentsList, c, \alpha, VideoProperties)$;
return $Test, r_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha$

Window Size	3 min 10 s
Mean throughput	2 Mbps
Capacity Time Slot	1 s
Video Length	3 min
Segment Length	1s
Video frame rate	30 fps
Playback cache	4s
Bitrate levels Mbps	[0.4 0.75 1 2.5 4.5]
Levels weights	[0.09 0.17 0.22 0.55 1]

TABLE I
SIMULATIONS PARAMETERS.



Fig. 10. Variation of α_{th} as function of a.



Fig. 11. Playback buffer state evolution and correspondent bitrate levels as function of a.

[22] [23]. To the best of our knowledge, there is no explicit way to compute the weight that can be accorded to each video level. In [16], authors explore a QoE estimation model in which each video segment is assigned a QoE_{seg} that varies logarithmically with its bitrate level and its motion factor. In this paper, we assign the weights proportionally to the corresponding bitrate levels as follows:

$w_i = b_i/(\sum_{i=1}^{L} b_i)$ where b_i is the i^{th} bitrate level and w_i is its corresponding weight. All the parameters are listed in Table I. To give more accuracy to our simulation results, we explore the values of α in an optimal way. Our heuristic approach (INVEST) will be later discussed in section V-D.

B. Simulation results

Fig. 5 outlines the dynamic of the capacity used for all the simulation section and its correspondent threshold α. It will be impossible to send the video with the lowest quality if α exceeds its maximum value. When we set α to c_{min}, we have the maximum cost in network utilization and the maximum QoE as if we did not apply a threshold strategy. The latter case will be referred to as a benchmark from now on.

The execution of the NEWCAST algorithm shows a variation on the system performance for a between 4.50 and 4.70. In the following, we will focus our analysis on three values of a: low, medium and high. Denote by α_{th} the resulting threshold α after running NEWCAST.

Fig. 10 depicts the variation of α_{th} as function of a. A low value of a results in a high α_{th} as it prioritizes the system cost. A high value of a, however, implies that the system uses almost all the future resources and gives a low threshold as it accords more importance to the QoE. A medium a results in a medium threshold which balances between QoE and system cost.

In Fig. 11 we plot the playback buffer state evolution over time and its correspondent streamed bitrate levels for the three aforementioned values of a. When a is small, many silent times are noticed and the buffer state evolves with a high slope (mainly at the beginning and the middle of the video). This is due to the bad quality of the segments being streamed. Notice that the player streams as much frames as the bitrate level decreases. More flexibility is noticed for a medium value of a, with shorter silent times and better QoE. For a big value of a, no silent times are noticed since almost all the network resources are being used. The buffer state evolves gradually with a low slope, given the fact that segments of high-order level are being streamed.

Now we study the impact of enforcing a stall to see its impact on the performance of our scheme. In Fig. 12, we plot the initial playback buffer state variation over the time for the same three values of a. We compute the resulting $\mathcal{F}$ before and after enforcing a stall at multiple emplacements of the video. As illustrated in Fig. 12, for $a = 4.5$, high fluctuations have been noticed around the original $\mathcal{F}$ mainly at the beginning of the video. The lowest values of $\mathcal{F}$ are obtained at moments where the initial buffer state is critical, i.e., no much flexibility regarding the stall constraint and a low quality level. At these moments, the critical state of the buffer results in setting a low threshold to avoid a constraint violation. Enforcing a stall at this moment, results in increasing the threshold at the right part of the video, which reduces the overall system cost. Now, by increasing a, we observe a decreasing of the resulting function $\mathcal{F}$. Thus, forcing a stall



Fig. 12. System performance with buffer stall enforcement.

results in a better quality at the beginning of the video at the expense of flexibility, which condemns the QoE for the rest of the video. This degradation in global QoE induces a reduction in global system cost that outweighs the resulting $\mathcal{F}$. To sum it up, enforcing a stall would be interesting only for low values of a, since it may reduce the system cost. A judicious choice of the stall's emplacement would be at the moments where the initial buffer state is critical.

C. Robustness under realistic prediction errors

One key limitation of our work is that there is still no accurate approach to predict the network capacity over up to ten seconds of the future without errors. In order to evaluate the robustness of our approach we use the HSDPA dataset [1] to predict with some errors the future throughput. The HSDPA dataset [1] consists of 30 minutes of continuous measurements of throughput of a moving device in Telenor's 3G/HSDPA wireless mobile network. We use traces of the Ljabru-Jernbanetorget trajectory as it has the least variance in throughput spacial variability. A temporal mapping of the streaming throughput is performed by supposing the user moving at a speed of 50Kmph. Assuming the same configuration as in table I, we evaluate the performance of our scheme using the mean-throughput of all realizations' throughput. The robustness of our scheme is evaluated by computing the difference between performances $\mathcal{P}_{mean}$ at optimal solution using mean-throughput and performances $\mathcal{P}_{real}$ at optimal solution using one realization throughput, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_{error} = |\frac{\mathcal{P}_{real} - \mathcal{P}_{mean}}{\mathcal{P}_{mean}}|$$



Fig. 13. Experimental real spacial variations of the capacity for the tramway Ljabru-Jernbanetorget trajectory.



Fig. 14. Error rates on the system performances under throughput prediction errors.

Results in Fig.14 show an average error rate less than 15% for both the system cost and the QoE. We also observe that the system cost is less sensitive for small values of a and that the QoE is less sensitive for high values of a. But in general, our scheme performs well even with errors in the prediction of future capacity.



Fig. 15. Accuracy and complexity variations with sampling period.



Fig. 16. Accuracy and complexity variations with Q.

D. Complexity

1) System performance under bigger sampling periods: In Fig. 15, we compute the mean execution time of NEWCAST (using optimal thresholds) by averaging results on 100 (randomly generated) capacities and using different sampling periods (from 1s to 5s). It takes almost 4s to compute the final strategy with a sampling period of 1s. As expected, using bigger sampling periods takes much shorter time. However, this comes at the expand of the final result accuracy depending on the value of a. In the same figure, we show the system response for each sampling period by averaging results over the 100 capacities. We compute an accuracy rate factor (≤ 1) by comparing the obtained results with result of 1s sampling period. In our model, we assume that in a time slot only one bitrate level can be streamed, which explains why using bigger sampling periods may add constraints on the QoE. For high values of a, very slight degradation is noticed since the system tends to use all the network resources. However, for low values of a, the constraints have bigger impact since the system tends to use less network resources which explains the higher degradation on the QoE, and, by the sequel, the higher reduction in system cost.

2) System performance with the INVEST approach: We fix the sampling period to 1s and run NEWCAST for different amounts of data Q (between 1Mbit and 5Mbit) by averaging results on the same 100 capacities.Results in Fig.16 show that setting Q to the mean throughput ($2Mbps$) leads to a high accuracy rate ($\approx$ 1s) with an execution time of 4s (as for optimal thresholds). Setting lower amounts of data, increases the execution time and keeps almost the same accuracy. For higher Q, the complexity is notably reduced, but slight variations are noticed on the accuracy rate (less than 16%). A judicious choice of Q should then be made depending on the operator's preferences; High QoE comes at high Q and very low complexity, however low system cost comes at low Q and higher complexity.

VI. Conclusion

In this paper we developed and analysed new scheme for optimising the delivery of stored video that exploits knowledge of future capacity. Our solution is designed to achieve high QoE and minimum system utilisation while taking into account important video client preferences such as video quality and re-buffering events. Our analysis show the possibility to use our algorithms as an online protocol well suited for dynamic adaptive streaming over HTTP. Interesting future direction consists of incorporating the prediction error of the capacity in the utility function in order to improve the robustness of our approach under higher prediction errors.

References

[1] Dataset: Hsdpa-bandwidth logs for mobile http streaming scenarios. http://home.ifi.uio.no/paalh/dataset/hsdpa-tcp-logs/.

[2] J. De Vriendt, D. De Vleeschauwer, and D. Robinson, "Model for estimating qoe of video delivered using http adaptive streaming," in *Integrated Network Management (IM 2013), 2013 IFIP/IEEE International Symposium on*, May 2013, pp. 1288–1293.

[3] F. Dobrian, A. Awan, D. Joseph, A. Ganjam, J. Zhan, V. Sekar, I. Stoica, and H. Zhang, "Understanding the impact of video quality on user engagement," in *ACM SIGCOMM*, 2011.

[4] A. Balachandran, V. Sekar, A. Akella, S. Seshan, I. Stoica, and H. Zhang, "Developing a predictive model of quality of experience for internet video," in *ACM SIGCOMM*, 2013.

[5] M. Z. Shafiq and J. Erman and L. Ji and A. X. Liu and Jeffrey Pang and Jia Wang, "Understanding the impact of network dynamics on mobile video user engagement," in *SIGMETRICS*, 2014.

[6] C. Yim and A. C. Bovik, "Evaluation of temporal variation of video quality in packet loss networks," in *Signal Processing: Image Communication*, 2011.

[7] T. Stockhammer, "Dynamic adaptive streaming over http: Standards and design principles," in *Second Annual ACM Conference on Multimedia Systems*, 2011.

[8] T. C. Thang, H. T. Le, A. T. Pham, and Y. M. Ro, "An evaluation of bitrate adaptation methods for HTTP live streaming," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 2014.

[9] T. Y. Huang, R. Johari, N. McKeown, M. Trunnell, and M. Watson, "A buffer-based approach to rate adaptation: Evidence from a large video streaming service," in *ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication (SIGCOMM)*, 2014.

[10] G. Tian and Y. Liu, "Towards agile and smooth video adaptation in dynamic http streaming," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, 2012.

[11] X. Yin, A. Jindal, V. Sekar, and B. Sinopoli, "A control-theoretic approach for dynamic adaptive video streaming over http," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, pp. 325–338, 2015.

[12] A. Jain and A. Terzis and N. Sprecher and P. Szilagyi and H. Flinck, "Mobile Throughput Guidance Signaling Protocol draft-flinck-mobile-throughput-guidance-00," *IETF*, April 2014.

[13] Expert Working Group on 5G Challenges Research Priorities, and Recommendations, "Networld 2020 etp," *White paper*, Aug. 2014.

[14] X. K. Zou, J. Erman, V. Gopalakrishnan, E. Halepovic, R. Jana, X. Jin, J. Rexford, and R. K. Sinha, "Can accurate predictions improve video streaming in cellular networks?" in *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications*, 2015.

[15] C. Liu, I. Bouazizi, and M. Gabbouj, "Rate adaptation for adaptive http streaming," in *ACM Multimedia Syst.*, 2011.

[16] Y. Shen, Y. Liu, Q. Liu, and D. Yang, "A method of qoe evaluation for adaptive streaming based on bitrate distribution," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications, Workshops Proceedings*, 2014.

[17] S. Egger, B. Gardlo, M. Seufert, and R. Schatz, "The impact of adaptation strategies on perceived quality of http adaptive streaming," in *Proceedings of the 2014 Workshop on Design, Quality and Deployment of Adaptive Video Streaming*, 2014.

[18] J. Jiang, V. Sekar, and H. Zhang, “Improving fairness, efficiency, and stability in http-based adaptive video streaming with festive,” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*, 2012.
[19] A. K. Moorthy, L. K. Choi, A. C. Bovik, and G. de Veciana, “Video quality assessment on mobile devices: Subjective, behavioral and objective studies.” *J. Sel. Topics Signal Processing*, pp. 652–671, 2012.
[20] V. Joseph and G. de Veciana, “Nova: Qoe-driven optimization of dash-based video delivery in networks.” *CoRR*, 2013.
[21] Z. Lu and G. de Veciana, “Optimizing stored video delivery for mobile networks: The value of knowing the future.” in *INFOCOM*, 2013.
[22] Parametres, debits et resolutions de l’encodeur d’evenements en direct. https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/2853702?hl=fr.
[23] S. Lederer, C. Müller, and C. Timmerer, “Dynamic adaptive streaming over http dataset,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd Multimedia Systems Conference*, 2012.